





with preparation to throw off the despot. A great crisis is at hand. And brave Hungary, whose women have been whipped and whose patriots have been slaughtered by the infamous butchers of the house of Hapsburg, will soon rise again. There is no reason to suppose that Hungary has such a leader and European Republicanism such a councillor and friend, as this glorious Kosuth?

With all this before him, the editor of the *Liberator* comes, out and openly declares "Kosuth is Fallen!" Oh, this is pitiable! Kosuth's whole life shows where he stands, and he thinks of slaves, and the recent deaths of the country, his character and vitalizes the sentiment of freedom, wherever it comes. But the *Liberator* would have this man madly defend his own special mission to this republic, which is so important to his country, and for which he has so wisely, and, in doing that, his own work truly and wisely, and, in doing that, he will do more for freedom in this country than he can accomplish by any other means.

"It is a palpable pro-slavery dodge," says the *Liberator*. That paper should be very cautious how it uses the word "dodge." The *Liberator*, some time ago, perpetrated the most palpable and malicious "dodge" we have observed among the editorial fraternity for two or three years. It will remember how carefully and persistently it dodged our question respecting its joy over George Thompson's election to Parliament.

As to Kosuth, everything about him shows the unshrinking fidelity and truth of his character. He speaks to us with the utmost frankness. He tells us what he means and what he wants. Every look and tone, every movement of his hand and face, shows that double-dealing is now, and ever has been, foreign to him. He has his own great work to do. Let him do it. For the present, we are content with the speeches against American slavery which are made by his characteristic and noble nature, and for the rest, we will leave to the public opinion of free and independent Hungary, and for the influence on our Republic of the coming Republic of Europe. Kosuth will do his work. Be assured of that. Let us do our like wise, earnest men, who can justly appreciate all influences that work in our favor, and be steadily hopeful of the future.

From the Banner of the Times.

#### KOSUTH.

While we would not express ourselves in too censorious language, we cannot but regret his yielding to the oppressive demands of our Republic. We cannot believe the illustrations which exist in this land of professed liberty, neither can we believe his great heart can be moved in view of the wrongs of any portion of the great family of mankind. We do not doubt that Kosuth's mission will result in good for Hungary, and we trust for all Europe. That the name of Louis Kosuth will be engraved upon the hearts of millions yet unborn, whether Hungary shall gain her independence through his immediate instrumentality, or the work he has commenced be left for another to finish, needs no prophetic eye to foresee. We ardently hope and believe Hungary will yet be free; and the same freedom which we so devoutly pray may yet be to the land of Hungary, will be to the land of the oppressed of every land. And as we look forward to the day when universal emancipation shall have been ushered in, who can fail to see that those who now are the oppressors will be held up to execration? Can it be expected that the neglect of the professed champions of freedom will be forgotten? And can it be expected that this unkind act will be forgotten by those who have claimed upon his sympathy? Will not the sons of Africa say—"In the day when we were in bondage and asked your sympathy, you mocked at our distresses, and received homage at the hands of our oppressors! While you pleaded with burning eloquence the cause of liberty for the children of your own fatherland, you refused to exchange even the least of mutual sympathy with those who were laboring to achieve the same boon for their brethren, whose lives were made bitter by reason of bondage?"

#### QUESTIONS.

##### KOSUTH IN PHILADELPHIA.

There was, of course, a prodigious display of busting, culminated with a sort of patriotic motto. Across Fifth street at Arch, at the Anti-Slavery Head Quarters, was suspended a white flag, on which was inscribed—

##### WELCOME THE EXILE!

EVERY INHABITANT OF THE LAND SHOULD BE FREE, AND EQUAL BEFORE THE LAW.

Kosuth.

Below this was an accurate representation of the old Independence Bell, with its inscription in prominent letters—

"PROCLAIM LIBERTY THROUGHOUT ALL THE LAND, UNTO ALL THE INHABITANTS THEREOF."

Nowhere else did we see a flag at once so beautiful and so appropriate. It attracted a great deal of attention, and the fugitive and his companions looked at it with evident interest. There was only one word on it that we would have cared to change, and that was "Exile," for which we would have substituted "Fugitive," as being more accurate as well as more expressive. But our friend, Judge Kane, who courteously permitted us to fasten one end of our cord in his garret window, thought that a too incendiary word! The newspapers, in noticing our flag, merely suppressed the fact, that it was hung up by the Abolitionists. In other cases they were careful to give the appropriate credit, and we knew they did not fail of doing so in this instance from lack of reliable information.

The procession halted in front of Independence Hall, into which Kosuth, after glancing, was conducted. Here Mayor Gilpin spoke an official welcome, to which Kosuth replied. The Mayor told the fugitive that this was the hall where the fathers of the Republic, proclaimed their independence; but he did not tell him that this very building is now used by their degenerate sons, and by some who were then present, to re-bind the chains of slavery upon the "wretched Kosuths of our native land," nor that under that once hallowed roof had a man been tried for treason for refusing to aid in sending back into bondage fugitives from a despotic, to which that of Austria affords no parallel. Judge Kane was there, but however proud he might have been of the laurels he had lately won, he did not exhibit them to the admiring eyes of Kosuth.

Among the speakers at this dinner was Judge Kane, who seemed determined to make the most of a good opportunity to impress the people with the fact, that notwithstanding his indecent slavery in branding his own fellow-citizens as traitors, he had perfectly sublime appreciation of the traitor from Hungary, and was as ready to fight the battles of freedom all over the world, as Mr. Pecksniff was to bestow his goods upon the poor.

The weary fugitive was not so extensively bored by private depredations here as he was at New York. He did not wholly escape this species of annoyance. The Sunday Dispatch thus notices one case:—

On Friday, some twenty clergymen waited on Kosuth, and tendered him their respects. They were in no general way known, nor the reason why they should have ventured upon a movement rather unchristian. If we can gather anything from the context of the address made to the Mayor by the "Fourth of July preacher," we infer that the movement was a sectarian effort to the attack of Bishop Hughes on Kosuth. Mr. Chalmers was not, of course, present, in fact, because, as the following extract will testify:—

"It must be—and if the worst must come to the worst, and you have to stand on the battle-field, side by side with the champions of liberty, grasp the hilt of the sword of freedom, and give the sheath to the winds, and with the cry of 'the sword of the Lord and Gideon'—say, 'the sword of the Lord and Gideon'—let it move on triumphantly, till not only your own country shall be free, and the Bible spread like the leaves of the morning of autumn, but till the whole world shall feel its impulse."

If any man who was not a clergyman had made such a transformation of a biblical quotation as was made on that occasion by the Rev. John Chambers, the latter would have been foremost in denouncing him for impiety and blasphemy. The mingling of Bible and bloodshed in this extract, the invocation to Kosuth to go forth like a Christian Mahomet, with the sword in one hand and the Scimitar in the other, will be highly admired by Mr. Chambers' fellow-members of the Peace Society.

This Mr. Chambers, as the Abolitionists well know, is a clerical braver, who is as apt at quoting Scripture in defence of slavery as of war. Of his merits in other respects we are unable to speak.—*Pennsylvania Freeman.*

"We are filled with surprise and regret on reading the following letter from Judge Jay. Who could have supposed that such a man would wish Kosuth, as the professed friend of liberty, to pass through this country untried, uninterrogated, and dumb, in regard to our great national system of slavery?"

From the National Anti-Slavery Standard.

#### LETTER FROM JUDGE JAY.

MR. EDITOR: I observe from the last number of your paper, that you disapprove of the letter to Kosuth, signed by the gentlemen who presented to him the address from the Executive Committee of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society. You are pleased to remark: "Judge Jay's name will be observed, was not appended to the letter, although it was to the address. We doubt if he was consulted, and his approbation gained, for presenting the anti-slavery cause in this humiliating attitude."

I cannot consent to accept the sentiment which you thus implicitly pay me, because to me is more precious than any other for my country, because so intimately connected with the fate of liberty and independence of nations of Europe, as formerly it was intimately connected with the security of Christendom.

I thank God that he deemed me not unworthy to set and to suffer for my fatherland. I thank God that the fate of my country became so intimately connected with the fate of liberty and independence of nations of Europe, as formerly it was intimately connected with the security of Christendom.

I thank God that my country's unnumbered woes and my personal sufferings became an opportunity to set a manifestation of the spirit and principles of your Republic.

May God the Almighty bless you with a long life, that you may long enjoy the happiness to see your country great, glorious and free, the corner-stone of international justice, and the column of freedom on earth, as it is already an asylum to the oppressed.

Sir, I pledge to your country the everlasting gratitude of Hungary.

The President replied briefly to M. Kosuth's address, in substance as follows:

I am happy, Governor Kosuth, to welcome you to this land of freedom; and it gives me pleasure to congratulate you upon your release from a long confinement in Turkey, and your safe arrival here. As an individual, I sympathized deeply with you in your brave struggle for the independence and freedom of your native land. The American people can never be indifferent to such a contest, but our policy as a nation in this respect has been uniform, from the commencement of our government; and my own views, as the Chief Executive Magistrate of this nation, are fully and freely expressed in my recent message to Congress, to which you have been pleased to allude.

They are the same, whether speaking to Congress here, or to the nations of Europe.

Should your country be restored to independence and freedom, I should then wish you, as the greatest blessing you could then enjoy, a restoration to your native land; but should that never happen, I can only repeat my welcome to you and your companions here, and pray that God's blessing may rest upon you wherever your lot may be cast.

And here the interview terminated.

For an extract from the speech of the Reverend asper of the anti-slavery cause and its advocates in this country—JOHN GUTHRIE, of Greenock, Scotland—to which the following letter from our faithful coadjutor, GEORGE THOMPSON, is in reply, see "Relapse of Oppression," first page.

From the Glasgow Christian News.

LETTER FROM GEORGE THOMPSON, ESQ.

M. P. IN REPLY TO REV. MR. GUTHRIE'S ANTI-SLAVERY SPEECH.

128 Sloan Street, London, Nov. 30, 1851.

Sunday Evening.

MY DEAR FRIEND—Two days ago, I obtained your favor of the 26th, with its accompanying letter. Your information was just what I required to give me an insight into the present state of the anti-slavery cause in Glasgow.

I have read with deep grief the speech of the Rev. John Guthrie, of Greenock. How lamentable are the rancor and falsehood of sectarianism! How hateful is it to the cause of humanity throughout the world!

I know not how to characterize Mr. Guthrie's statements. They are utterly untrue. How a minister of the gospel, can deliberately promulgate such calumnies for the purpose of murdering the reputation of the most devoted philanthropist the world contains, I know not.

If my evidence is of any worth, in regard to the spirit in which the abolitionists whom Mr. Guthrie traduces, prosecute their humane work, I give it you on more than the guarantee of an Englishman; the felt and acknowledged responsibility of a reverent believer in the Bible to speak the truth.

The men and women of America, who are the victims of the industrious misrepresentation of parties in this country, (as if it were not enough to leave them alone in the midst of their myriads of unrelenting foes, who were so intimately known to me. I am the latest, as I am the best informed witness on the subject of their proceedings. As a witness, I am the more competent to speak, because I have not only been an actual observer of facts, and in the full confidence of the parties accused, but understand perfectly the theological opinions of their accusers. When I speak as one who is one, I would say, "I am bolder than any other, but my religious views simply—the persons who gravely charge me with transatlantic friends with making the anti-slavery cause subservient to the diffusion of the doctrine of murder, rape and arson, are persons whose belief, touching the great doctrines of revealed truth, is in itself of Evangelical origin. I can do no wish except—

Still more, I admit that there are persons amongst the most distinguished and devoted of the American abolitionists, whose theological views are what are termed heterodox. But having made these declarations and admissions, I am prepared to affirm, and most solemnly aver, that when charges are made that—

"They base abolition on directly infidel principles," that "They propose infidel resolutions at public meetings," and that "They do their utmost to identify Christianity and slavery, and to inculcate with their poison every fugitive slave that comes in their way," such charges are no more true, than would be charges of murder, rape and arson.

Individuals like Mr. Guthrie should remember, that if they regard the acts they impute to American abolitionists, as amongst the most wicked and pernicious that can be committed, they should be the more cautious in bringing their charges. I know what Mr. Guthrie's accusations mean; and I know what the effect will be upon the minds of persons who take their opinions from Mr. Guthrie. If I had heard Mr. Guthrie utter the words I have quoted, I should have stood up and said, "You are a false accuser."

Within the last year, I have spent eight months in the United States. Seven of these months were spent among the abolitionists of the Garrisonian party; and during that period, I never heard a speech delivered or a resolution proposed, inconsistent with the views of Drs. Wardlaw, King and Anderson. Both speakers and resolutions would have been unacceptable (as far as doctrines and principles are concerned) in every Evangelical Church in Scotland.

This is my testimony, and you may do with it what you please. I trust very soon to have the opportunity of rebutting the calumnies of Mr. Guthrie more effectually.

Yours, truly,

GEORGE THOMPSON.

Mr. Wm. Smeal, Glasgow.

AMERICAN ABOLITIONISTS IN ENGLAND. REV. DR. PENNINGTON is reported by the New York Sun to have made the following remark in the course of a recent speech in Brooklyn: "When he went to their country, [England] he had found most of them misinformed with respect to the friends of Anti-Slavery in America. The impression among them was, that they were all infidels, anti-everything that was good. He endeavored to dispel their misapprehensions of this prejudice, and succeeded." Dr. Pennington's own party began this work of denouncing American Abolitionists in England as infidels, as long ago as 1840, and pro-slavery divines from this side of the water, taking the hint from Colver and Scoble, have played the same game, only with a wider application of the odious epithet, until the original instigators of the mischief are at length considered makers of a defensive attitude. Whether Dr. Pennington would be more than to defend the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society or not, is more than we know. We would be sorry to believe that an intelligent colored man had lent himself to the work of underlining the confidence of English abolitionists in Garrison and his associates.—*Pennsylvania Freeman.*

NEW YORK, DEC. 30, 1851.

From Frederick Douglass's Paper.

JESUITISM OF KOSUTH AND THE AMERICAN AND FOREIGN A. S. SOCIETY.

FREDERICK DOUGLASS:—The following Address of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, to Louis Kosuth, and his unqualified reply, I find in the morning Tribune, Dec. 10:—

[These proceedings have already been published in the Liberator.]—*Ed. Lib.*

The ethics of this whole affair are worthy of Dr. Pusey. In plain Anglo-Saxon, William Jay, Lewis Tappan, and the Executive Committee of the American and Foreign A. S. Society, congratulate Kosuth that he was an abolitionist of slavery, caste, and every species of oppression in Hungary, but do not, in the *liberal* or *circumlocution* in which he is placed, (as the avowed guest,) desire him to be a thorough abolitionist here! and so urgent is their desire to have Kosuth stand in America uncommitted to the slavery question, that they accompanied their Address with a prudential letter, requesting Kosuth not to reply, as the response might, in the opinion of some persons, have the appearance of committing him to the friends of the slave. These men, from time to time, have, in words, repudiated the "supping and mining policy" of the A. B. C. F. M.; but in deed, are they not now endorsing that same Jesuitical and Atheistic policy? Here is the doctrine, that an illustrious exile, because an invited guest of the nation, must occupy a neutral, non-interference policy towards the giant sin of the nation! Himself free to ask intervention for freedom in Hungary—intervention against the despotism of Russia, and not only disclaiming intervention for the freedom of three millions of our oppressed, but even refusing to speak for the dumb here, that he may cajole and influence the United States to speak, if need be, in the thunder of cannon, for the dumb of Hungary; and the officials of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society come forward in the name of freedom, to baptize the policy!

What is this, but bartering the liberties of three millions of Americans for the liberties of five millions of Hungarians? Because the guest of a great nation, am I to compliment his follies, and pass in review before his public sin, while enlarging his many virtues? This will not do. These men, from time to time, have, in words, repudiated the "supping and mining policy" of the A. B. C. F. M.; but in deed, are they not now endorsing that same Jesuitical and Atheistic policy? Here is the doctrine, that an illustrious exile, because an invited guest of the nation, must occupy a neutral, non-interference policy towards the giant sin of the nation! Himself free to ask intervention for freedom in Hungary—intervention against the despotism of Russia, and not only disclaiming intervention for the freedom of three millions of our oppressed, but even refusing to speak for the dumb here, that he may cajole and influence the United States to speak, if need be, in the thunder of cannon, for the dumb of Hungary; and the officials of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society come forward in the name of freedom, to baptize the policy!

What is this, but bartering the liberties of three millions of Americans for the liberties of five millions of Hungarians? Because the guest of a great nation, am I to compliment his follies, and pass in review before his public sin, while enlarging his many virtues? This will not do. These men, from time to time, have, in words, repudiated the "supping and mining policy" of the A. B. C. F. M.; but in deed, are they not now endorsing that same Jesuitical and Atheistic policy? Here is the doctrine, that an illustrious exile, because an invited guest of the nation, must occupy a neutral, non-interference policy towards the giant sin of the nation! Himself free to ask intervention for freedom in Hungary—intervention against the despotism of Russia, and not only disclaiming intervention for the freedom of three millions of our oppressed, but even refusing to speak for the dumb here, that he may cajole and influence the United States to speak, if need be, in the thunder of cannon, for the dumb of Hungary; and the officials of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society come forward in the name of freedom, to baptize the policy!

What is this, but bartering the liberties of three millions of Americans for the liberties of five millions of Hungarians? Because the guest of a great nation, am I to compliment his follies, and pass in review before his public sin, while enlarging his many virtues? This will not do. These men, from time to time, have, in words, repudiated the "supping and mining policy" of the A. B. C. F. M.; but in deed, are they not now endorsing that same Jesuitical and Atheistic policy? Here is the doctrine, that an illustrious exile, because an invited guest of the nation, must occupy a neutral, non-interference policy towards the giant sin of the nation! Himself free to ask intervention for freedom in Hungary—intervention against the despotism of Russia, and not only disclaiming intervention for the freedom of three millions of our oppressed, but even refusing to speak for the dumb here, that he may cajole and influence the United States to speak, if need be, in the thunder of cannon, for the dumb of Hungary; and the officials of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society come forward in the name of freedom, to baptize the policy!

What is this, but bartering the liberties of three millions of Americans for the liberties of five millions of Hungarians? Because the guest of a great nation, am I to compliment his follies, and pass in review before his public sin, while enlarging his many virtues? This will not do. These men, from time to time, have, in words, repudiated the "supping and mining policy" of the A. B. C. F. M.; but in deed, are they not now endorsing that same Jesuitical and Atheistic policy? Here is the doctrine, that an illustrious exile, because an invited guest of the nation, must occupy a neutral, non-interference policy towards the giant sin of the nation! Himself free to ask intervention for freedom in Hungary—intervention against the despotism of Russia, and not only disclaiming intervention for the freedom of three millions of our oppressed, but even refusing to speak for the dumb here, that he may cajole and influence the United States to speak, if need be, in the thunder of cannon, for the dumb of Hungary; and the officials of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society come forward in the name of freedom, to baptize the policy!

What is this, but bartering the liberties of three millions of Americans for the liberties of five millions of Hungarians? Because the guest of a great nation, am I to compliment his follies, and pass in review before his public sin, while enlarging his many virtues? This will not do. These men, from time to time, have, in words, repudiated the "supping and mining policy" of the A. B. C. F. M.; but in deed, are they not now endorsing that same Jesuitical and Atheistic policy? Here is the doctrine, that an illustrious exile, because an invited guest of the nation, must occupy a neutral, non-interference policy towards the giant sin of the nation! Himself free to ask intervention for freedom in Hungary—intervention against the despotism of Russia, and not only disclaiming intervention for the freedom of three millions of our oppressed, but even refusing to speak for the dumb here, that he may cajole and influence the United States to speak, if need be, in the thunder of cannon, for the dumb of Hungary; and the officials of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society come forward in the name of freedom, to baptize the policy!

What is this, but bartering the liberties of three millions of Americans for the liberties of five millions of Hungarians? Because the guest of a great nation, am I to compliment his follies, and pass in review before his public sin, while enlarging his many virtues? This will not do. These men, from time to time, have, in words, repudiated the "supping and mining policy" of the A. B. C. F. M.; but in deed, are they not now endorsing that same Jesuitical and Atheistic policy? Here is the doctrine, that an illustrious exile, because an invited guest of the nation, must occupy a neutral, non-interference policy towards the giant sin of the nation! Himself free to ask intervention for freedom in Hungary—intervention against the despotism of Russia, and not only disclaiming intervention for the freedom of three millions of our oppressed, but even refusing to speak for the dumb here, that he may cajole and influence the United States to speak, if need be, in the thunder of cannon, for the dumb of Hungary; and the officials of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society come forward in the name of freedom, to baptize the policy!

What is this, but bartering the liberties of three millions of Americans for the liberties of five millions of Hungarians? Because the guest of a great nation, am I to compliment his follies, and pass in review before his public sin, while enlarging his many virtues? This will not do. These men, from time to time, have, in words, repudiated the "supping and mining policy" of the A. B. C. F. M.; but in deed, are they not now endorsing that same Jesuitical and Atheistic policy? Here is the doctrine, that an illustrious exile, because an invited guest of the nation, must occupy a neutral, non-interference policy towards the giant sin of the nation! Himself free to ask intervention for freedom in Hungary—intervention against the despotism of Russia, and not only disclaiming intervention for the freedom of three millions of our oppressed, but even refusing to speak for the dumb here, that he may cajole and influence the United States to speak, if need be, in the thunder of cannon, for the dumb of Hungary; and the officials of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society come forward in the name of freedom, to baptize the policy!

What is this, but bartering the liberties of three millions of Americans for the liberties of five millions of Hungarians? Because the guest of a great nation, am I to compliment his follies, and pass in review before his public sin, while enlarging his many virtues? This will not do. These men, from time to time, have, in words, repudiated the "supping and mining policy" of the A. B. C. F. M.; but in deed, are they not now endorsing that same Jesuitical and Atheistic policy? Here is the doctrine, that an illustrious exile, because an invited guest of the nation, must occupy a neutral, non-interference policy towards the giant sin of the nation! Himself free to ask intervention for freedom in Hungary—intervention against the despotism of Russia, and not only disclaiming intervention for the freedom of three millions of our oppressed, but even refusing to speak for the dumb here, that he may cajole and influence the United States to speak, if need be, in the thunder of cannon, for the dumb of Hungary; and the officials of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society come forward in the name of freedom, to baptize the policy!

What is this, but bartering the liberties of three millions of Americans for the liberties of five millions of Hungarians? Because the guest of a great nation, am I to compliment his follies, and pass in review before his public sin, while enlarging his many virtues? This will not do. These men, from time to time, have, in words, repudiated the "supping and mining policy" of the A. B. C. F. M.; but in deed, are they not now endorsing that same Jesuitical and Atheistic policy? Here is the doctrine, that an illustrious exile, because an invited guest of the nation, must occupy a neutral, non-interference policy towards the giant sin of the nation! Himself free to ask intervention for freedom in Hungary—intervention against the despotism of Russia, and not only disclaiming intervention for the freedom of three millions of our oppressed, but even refusing to speak for the dumb here, that he may cajole and influence the United States to speak, if need be, in the thunder of cannon, for the dumb of Hungary; and the officials of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society come forward in the name of freedom, to baptize the policy!

What is this, but bartering the liberties of three millions of Americans for the liberties of five millions of Hungarians? Because the guest of a great nation, am I to compliment his follies, and pass in review before his public sin, while enlarging his many virtues? This will not do. These men, from time to time, have, in words, repudiated the "supping and mining policy" of the A. B. C. F. M.; but in deed, are they not now endorsing that same Jesuitical and Atheistic policy? Here is the doctrine, that an illustrious exile, because an invited guest of the nation, must occupy a neutral, non-interference policy towards the giant sin of the nation! Himself free to ask intervention for freedom in Hungary—intervention against the despotism of Russia, and not only disclaiming intervention for the freedom of three millions of our oppressed, but even refusing to speak for the dumb here, that he may cajole and influence the United States to speak, if need be, in the thunder of cannon, for the dumb of Hungary; and the officials of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society come forward in the name of freedom, to baptize the policy!

What is this, but bartering the liberties of three millions of Americans for the liberties of five millions of Hungarians? Because the guest of a great nation, am I to compliment his follies, and pass in review before his public sin, while enlarging his many virtues? This will not do. These men, from time to time, have, in words, repudiated the "supping and mining policy" of the A. B. C. F. M.; but in deed, are they not now endorsing that same Jesuitical and Atheistic policy? Here is the doctrine, that an illustrious exile, because an invited guest of the nation, must occupy a neutral, non-interference policy towards the giant sin of the nation! Himself free to ask intervention for freedom in Hungary—intervention against the despotism of Russia, and not only disclaiming intervention for the freedom of three millions of our oppressed, but even refusing to speak for the dumb here, that he may cajole and influence the United States to speak, if need be, in the thunder of cannon, for the dumb of Hungary; and the officials of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society come forward in the name of freedom, to baptize the policy!

What is this, but bartering the liberties of three millions of Americans for the liberties of five millions of Hungarians? Because the guest of a great nation, am I to compliment his follies, and pass in review before his public sin, while enlarging his many virtues? This will not do. These men, from time to time, have, in words, repudiated the "supping and mining policy" of the A. B. C. F. M.; but in deed, are they not now endorsing that same Jesuitical and Atheistic policy? Here is the doctrine, that an illustrious exile, because an invited guest of the nation, must occupy a neutral, non-interference policy towards the giant sin of the nation! Himself free to ask intervention for freedom in Hungary—intervention against the despotism of Russia, and not only disclaiming intervention for the freedom of three millions of our oppressed, but even refusing to speak for the dumb here, that he may cajole and influence the United States to speak, if need be, in the thunder of cannon, for the dumb of Hungary; and the officials of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society come forward in the name of freedom, to baptize the policy!

What is this, but bartering the liberties of three millions of Americans for the liberties of five millions of Hungarians? Because the guest of a great nation, am I to compliment his follies, and pass in review before his public sin, while enlarging his many virtues? This will not do. These men, from time to time, have, in words, repudiated the "supping and mining policy" of the A. B. C. F. M.; but in deed, are they not now endorsing that same Jesuitical and Atheistic policy? Here is the doctrine, that an illustrious exile, because an invited guest of the nation, must occupy a neutral, non-interference policy towards the giant sin of the nation! Himself free to ask intervention for freedom in Hungary—intervention against the despotism of Russia, and not only disclaiming intervention for the freedom of three millions of our oppressed, but even refusing to speak for the dumb here, that he may cajole and influence the United States to speak, if need be, in the thunder of cannon, for the dumb of Hungary; and the officials of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society come forward in the name of freedom, to baptize the policy!

What is this, but bartering the liberties of three millions of Americans for the liberties of five millions of Hungarians? Because the guest of a great nation, am I to compliment his follies, and pass in review before his public sin, while enlarging his many virtues? This will not do. These men, from time to time, have, in words, repudiated the "supping and mining policy" of the A. B. C. F. M.; but in deed, are they not now endorsing that same Jesuitical and Atheistic policy? Here is the doctrine, that an illustrious exile, because an invited guest of the nation, must occupy a neutral, non-interference policy towards the giant sin of the nation! Himself free to ask intervention for freedom in Hungary—intervention against the despotism of Russia, and not only disclaiming intervention for the freedom of three millions of our oppressed, but even refusing to speak for the dumb here, that he may cajole and influence the United States to speak, if need be, in the thunder of cannon, for the dumb of Hungary; and the officials of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society come forward in the name of freedom, to baptize the policy!

What is this, but bartering the liberties of three millions of Americans for the liberties of five millions of Hungarians? Because the guest of a great nation, am I to compliment his follies, and pass in review before his public sin, while enlarging his many virtues? This will not do. These men, from time to time, have, in words, repudiated the "supping and mining policy" of the A. B. C. F. M.; but in deed, are they not now endorsing that same Jesuitical and Atheistic policy? Here is the doctrine, that an illustrious exile, because an invited guest of the nation, must occupy a neutral, non-interference policy towards the giant sin of the nation! Himself free to ask intervention for freedom in Hungary—intervention against the despotism of Russia, and not only disclaiming intervention for the freedom of three millions of our oppressed, but even refusing to speak for the dumb here, that he may cajole and influence the United States to speak, if need be, in the thunder of cannon, for the dumb of Hungary; and the officials of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society come forward in the name of freedom, to baptize the policy!

What is this, but bartering the liberties of three millions of Americans for the liberties of five millions of Hungarians? Because the guest of a great nation, am I to compliment his follies, and pass in review before his public sin, while enlarging his many virtues? This will not do. These men, from time to time, have, in words, repudiated the "supping and mining policy" of the A. B. C. F. M.; but in deed, are they not now endorsing that same Jesuitical and Atheistic policy? Here is the doctrine, that an illustrious exile, because an invited guest of the nation, must occupy a neutral, non-interference policy towards the giant sin of the nation! Himself free to ask intervention for freedom in Hungary—intervention against the despotism of Russia, and not only disclaiming intervention for the freedom of three millions of our oppressed, but even refusing to speak for the dumb here, that he may cajole and influence the United States to speak, if need be, in the thunder of cannon, for the dumb of Hungary; and the officials of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society come forward in the name of freedom, to baptize the policy!

What is this, but bartering the liberties of three millions of Americans for the liberties of five millions of Hungarians? Because the guest of a great nation, am I to compliment his follies, and pass in review before his public sin, while enlarging his many virtues? This will not do. These men, from time to time, have, in words, repudiated the "supping and mining policy" of the A. B. C. F. M.; but in deed, are they not now endorsing that same Jesuitical and Atheistic policy? Here is the doctrine, that an illustrious exile, because an invited guest of the nation, must occupy a neutral, non-interference policy towards the giant sin of the nation! Himself free to ask intervention for freedom in Hungary—intervention against the despotism of Russia, and not only disclaiming intervention for the freedom of three millions of our oppressed, but even refusing to speak for the dumb here, that he may cajole and influence the United States to speak, if need be, in the thunder of cannon, for the dumb of Hungary; and the officials of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society come forward in the name of freedom, to baptize the policy!

What is this, but bartering the liberties of three millions of Americans for the liberties of five millions of Hungarians? Because the guest of a great nation, am I to compliment his follies, and pass in review before his public sin, while enlarging his many virtues? This will not do. These men, from time to time, have, in words, repudiated the "supping and mining policy" of the A. B. C. F. M.; but in deed, are they not now endorsing that same Jesuitical and Atheistic policy? Here is the doctrine, that an illustrious exile, because an invited guest of the nation, must occupy a neutral, non-interference policy towards the giant sin of the nation! Himself free to ask intervention for freedom in Hungary—intervention against the despotism of Russia, and not only disclaiming intervention for the freedom of three millions of our oppressed, but even refusing to speak for the dumb here, that he may cajole and influence the United States to speak, if need be, in the thunder of cannon, for the dumb of Hungary; and the officials of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society come forward in the name of freedom, to baptize the policy!

What is this, but bartering the liberties of three millions of Americans for the liberties of five millions of Hungarians? Because the guest of a great nation, am I to compliment his follies, and pass in review before his public sin, while enlarging his many virtues? This will not do. These men, from time to time, have, in words, repudiated the "supping and mining policy" of the A. B. C. F. M.; but in deed, are they not now endorsing that same Jesuitical and Atheistic policy? Here is the doctrine, that an illustrious exile, because an invited guest of the nation, must occupy a neutral, non-interference policy towards the giant sin of the nation! Himself free to ask intervention for freedom in Hungary—intervention against the despotism of Russia, and not only disclaiming intervention for the freedom of three millions of our oppressed, but even refusing to speak for the dumb here, that he may cajole and influence the United States to speak, if need be, in the thunder of cannon, for the dumb of Hungary; and the officials of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society come forward in the name of freedom, to baptize the policy!

What is this, but bartering the liberties of three millions of Americans for the liberties of five millions of Hungarians? Because the guest of a great nation, am I to compliment his follies, and pass in review before his public sin, while enlarging his many virtues? This will not do. These men, from time to time, have, in words, repudiated the "supping and mining policy" of the A. B. C. F. M.; but in deed, are they not now endorsing that same Jesuitical and Atheistic policy? Here is the doctrine, that an illustrious exile, because an invited guest of the nation, must occupy a neutral, non-interference policy towards the giant sin of the nation! Himself free to ask intervention for freedom in Hungary—intervention against the despotism of Russia, and not only disclaiming intervention for the freedom of three millions of our oppressed, but even refusing to speak for the dumb here, that he may cajole and influence the United States to speak, if need be, in the thunder of cannon, for the dumb of Hungary; and the officials of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society come forward in the name of freedom, to baptize the policy!

What is this, but bartering the liberties of three millions of Americans for the liberties of five millions of Hungarians? Because the guest of a great nation, am I to compliment his









### ADDRESS TO THE NORTHMAN. BY MRS. FRANCES D. GAGE.

Do you ask what I think?—Do you ask what I feel?  
Come my thoughts from the pit? Is my heart made  
Of steel?  
Does the lamb skip and play when he hears the wolf  
Howl?  
Does the nightingale sing in the claw of the owl?  
Do the deer o'er the green hills go bounding no more?  
Has the eagle forgot on proud pinion to soar?  
Have justice and mercy deserted the earth?  
Love, kindness and feeling the home and the hearth?  
Could you think that aught else from my spirit would  
flow?  
But a dirge for my country of sorrow and woe?  
A dirge for my country of guilt and of wrong?  
A dirge for the weak, broken down by the strong?  
A dirge for the glory that's passing away?  
A dirge for our Fillmore, our Webster, our Clay?  
We, who to the few, who have sullied our stars:  
Who've forgotten our heroes, their toils and their  
scars!

The curse of the victim shall blacken each name;  
The scorn of the true man shall lead it to fame;  
As a blot, a pollution where'er it is traced,  
A word to be hated, dishonored, disgraced!

Oh, Northman! Oh, Northman! beware of the hour  
When you sell yourself out to the slaveholding  
power!

When you barter your soul for a five dollar fee,  
To fetter the spirit that dares to be free!  
Beware how you take up the shackles, to bind  
The limbs that have left a harsh master behind;  
Beware how you stand in the way of the brave,  
Who has manhood to feel he will not be a slave!  
Beware, if you covet such bloodshed and strife,  
How you trifle with what is far dearer than life;  
For hands strong and willing, from hill-top and plain,  
Will dare you to fasten the 'Fugitive's chain'!

Oh! who were your sires? Came they not from  
that land,  
Who spurned 't oppressor with heart and with hand;  
Who, with sword of Rebellion bound firm on their  
thigh,

Went forth with strong will to be freemen, or die?  
Signed their hands to that great Declaration, that we  
So boast—that 'all men are born equal and free';  
And now will you sully the name of those sires?  
Will you pull down home altars, and put out home  
fires?

Will you break the bruised heart for the tinge of the  
skin,  
And smother the godlike that's burning within?

Oh, Northman! Oh, Northman! beware of the day  
When you place yourself thus in hostile array  
'Gainst the seeker of Freedom, whatever his hue!  
Though his skin should be ashy, his soul may be true.

Is the Negro a Man? Hath his voice not a tone,  
A language, a music, that answers your own?  
Hath he not the same hopes? Hath he not the same  
fears?

Feels he not the same joys? Weeps he not the same  
tears?

Do not the same loves make his pulse wildly start?  
Are not wife—mother—sister, as dear to his heart?  
Bears he not the same sorrow? the same chastening  
rod?

Has he not the same Savior? has he not the same God?

Oh, Northman! Oh, Northman! will you be the  
knave,  
That will turn out to fetter the Fugitive Slave,  
And bind like a beast, for a master's control,  
The man to whom God gave a reasoning soul,  
And help bear him back into Slaverydom again,  
To toil out his years 'neath the lash and the chain—  
A curse to the land where his sweat-drops shall fall;  
A curse to the country that holds him in thrall!  
Oh, Northman! Oh, Northman! beware of the hour  
When you sell yourself out to the Slave-catching  
Power!

### From the Anti Slavery Bugle.

### WHERE CAN THE SLAVE FIND REST?

TELL ME—Where can the soul find rest?  
Tell me, thou Northern wind that cools my fevered  
blood,  
Dost thou not know some spot sacred to Freedom's  
God,  
Some dark and lonesome dell, some cave or mountain  
breast,  
Where, free from galling chains, the weary slave may  
rest?

The North wind dwindled to a whisper low,  
And moaned in sadness as it answered, No!  
Ye mighty Oceans tell, those waves around me roar,  
Know ye some favored spot upon Columbia's shore,  
Where pining captives find the bliss of which they  
dream,  
Where Slavery dare not come, and Freedom reigns  
supreme?

The far Pacific paused not in its flow,  
But echoed back the near Atlantic's No!  
And ye, bright stars that shine with steadfast light,  
Creation's gems upon the brow of night,  
See ye within my country's bounds no spot  
Which Slavery's blighting presence curseth not?  
And from the stars a voice, distinct and low,  
In soft and saddened tone responded, No!  
Tell me, my longing soul, oh tell me, Truth and  
Right,  
Is there no day of joy to follow slavery's night?  
Is there no future hour when sin and wrong shall  
cease,  
And all God's children live in brotherhood and  
peace?

Truth, Right, and Love, man's angel helpers given,  
Whispered, 'Be strong, toil on, and trust in Heaven.'  
B. S. J.

### From Dickens's Household Words.

### THE LAW OF MERCY.

'Tis written with the pen of heavenly Love  
On every heart which soul divine has moulded;  
A transcript from the statute book above,  
Where angels read their Sovereign's will unfolded.

It bids us seek the holes where famine lurks,  
Clutching the hoarded crust with trembling fingers;  
Where Toil in damp, unwholesome caverns works,  
Or with strained eyeballs o'er the needle lingers.

It bids us stand beside the dying bed  
Of those about to quit the world forever,  
Smooth the toss'd pillow, prop the sinking head,  
Cheer the heart-broken, whom death hates to sever.

It bids us tell the tempted that the joy  
Of guilt indulged will change ere long to sorrow;  
The draught of sickly sweetness soon will cloy,  
And pall upon the sated taste to-morrow.

And those who copy thus Christ's life on earth,  
Feeding the poor and comforting the weeper,  
Will all receive a meed of priceless worth,  
When zephyr gathered by the heavenly reaper.

### THE POOR.

'God help the poor!' Well said, but know  
That God helps them by man;  
You are his agent, reader, go,  
Do what you can!

## The Liberator.

### REPLY TO A SERMON OF DANIEL FOSTER, OF CONCORD, MASS.

Entitled, 'The Bible not an Inspired Book,' published in  
the Liberator of Nov. 14, 1851.

MR. EDITOR:

A mutual friend of yours and mine called my attention to a Sermon preached by Daniel Foster, of Concord, Mass., Oct. 26, 1851, and published by request in the Liberator of Nov. 14, entitled, 'The Bible not an Inspired Book.' Finding it an able production of its kind—its author apparently, as well as ostensibly, an educated man—the subject it essays to discuss being of the highest possible importance to the best interests and dearest hopes of man—its doctrines being in harmony with what, for fifteen years, I have supposed to be the theological views of the Liberator, and being commended by yourself to the candid perusal of your readers, as of no small importance, and having an undoubted bearing upon all reformatory movements extant, as well as others yet to come—I say, in view of all these circumstances, I feel induced to comply with the wishes of our friend, and offer some strictures upon it, to which, in my turn, I respectfully call your attention, hoping that you will let your readers have an equal opportunity of hearing what can be said on the opposite side of the question; or, rather, of the truthfulness of what is here said.

I am cautioned by our friend to be short. With this advice I shall endeavor to comply, by shunning the rhetorical Charybdis of being too lengthy, but I must also shun, with equal care, the Scylla of too much brevity on the other side—a thing not easy in the present case.

The first thing which called my attention was the preface in a short letter to you, (a thing exceedingly common in the Liberator,) in which the writer gives full evidence of being a genuine convert to the theology and other teachings of the Liberator, and especially the one under discussion—'The Bible not an Inspired Book.' Making this the title of his so-called Sermon, he gives the following passages for his text: John 18:37, and John 1:17—'To this end I am born, and for this end came I into the world, that I might bear witness unto the truth.' 'The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.' How these texts prove the non-inspiration of the Scriptures, or what connection they have with what he calls the Bible question, is difficult for me to see; and the use he makes of them, and the method he pursues to sustain his assumption—the non-inspiration of the Bible—is also to me very strange and extraordinary. Having fixed his issues with his opponents, by giving what he calls 'a concise, candid and just statement of the evangelical view of the Bible,' he proceeds to try this view by two standards—1st, Christ's life and teachings; 2d, by Reason. Here he states definitely the use he is to make of the selected passages. According to the statement of the first, 'Jesus came into the world to bear witness to the truth'; and, he says, 'I will bring his testimony to bear upon this question, and let his testimony decide the issue before us to-day.' To this I agree. Let us hear Christ, and abide by his testimony.

He continues—'In the second passage selected as my text, John makes a distinction between Moses and Christ, or, rather, between the system which Moses established and that which Christ promulgated. Moses gave the law, truth and grace came by Jesus Christ. The contrast here presented us is extremely significant, and I hope you will bear it in mind during this discussion.' To this I object, first, that John is not Christ—but the subject is to be settled by Christ and Reason, not by John; second, John was, according to Mr. F., never inspired, and, of course, is liable to err as Moses or Paul; third, I deny the inference drawn from the text, and the construction and meaning put upon it. Nothing, as it seems to me, can be more false, than to set Moses and Christ thus at variance; yes, and Christ, and John himself. If Christ and Moses are at odds, the fact must be proved by the testimony of Christ himself, not by forced construction and false inferences put upon words spoken by erring man, upon subjects having no bearing on the question at issue.

Our author then proceeds—I shall first examine the Bible—wherein it is mistaken and unchristian. 'I shall then give my own views of inspiration, and of the proper use of the Bible.' In the first proposition, two things are assumed, begged, or taken for granted, without proof, and dogmatically asserted, namely, that there are points wherein the Bible is mistaken and unchristian. The statement and argumentation of this proposition occupies six columns of your paper, and for caricature, misconception and misrepresentation, through the influence of blind superstition, produced by a false philosophy and a false theological education and training, or a malicious misrepresentation for party purposes, or for whatever assignable cause or occasion, I have never seen its equal in any infidel book, not excepting the 'Bible of Nature,' Herbert's Letters to Dr. Cooper of South Carolina, 'Paine's Age of Reason,' Hume's Works, Volney or Voltaire—no, nothing exceeds it. Call it Christianity, Garrisonism, Hicksism, Quakerism or truth—that is, the Bible or Old Testament truly represented, or whatever else you please, there it is, and speaks for itself; and speaks, no doubt, the views and feelings long cherished by yourself upon this subject, and by the Anti-Slavery Church, whose head and leader, father, friend and founder, you are, and whose organ and oracle is the Liberator. If in this I am under mistake, I wish to be corrected. If you, sir, as the editor of the Liberator, and father of a sect, by whatever name you please to call yourselves, as an association, society or organization, please have the goodness to say so, in plain words, and you will much relieve many who sincerely wish to be your friends and coadjutors in the anti-slavery cause, properly so called, who cannot and will not permit the Liberator, as it now is, to be read in their families, nor can they, in good conscience, bid it God-speed, or wish it success, or in any way aid its circulation, notwithstanding it contains much excellent and important matter.

I, for one, view the Liberator in almost the same light that you and friend Foster do the scriptures of the Old Testament. I esteem you and your special coadjutors just as he and you do Moses, the prophets, the apostles, Confucius, Zoroaster, the old heathen philosophers of Greece and Rome, viz.: as conceiving of and saying many excellent things, and mixing therewith as much or more falsehood, absurdity and folly. Your theological opinion is full of dead flies.

That the whole sum and substance of these six columns is a tissue of misconception and misrepresentation, as before said, is to me as clear as light; and to make it as clear to others as to myself, would be an easy task, all but its length. To copy and comment upon it in a manner satisfactory to myself is impossible in this communication, with the limits I have fixed to myself, agreeably to the advice and wish of my friend above alluded to; and in lieu of doing which, I will, for the sake of the argument, concede Mr. Foster to be right—to have rightly conceived of Moses, his history, his law, his political economy, the spirit of his institutions, his conception and treatment of woman among the rest. I will concede that the Old Testament is just what Mr. Foster and the Garrisonian Church conceive it to be, viz.: a mere mythology—an uninspired medley of strange notions about God, nature and man, and all their relations, connections and dependencies. That it resulted from the darkness of the ages in which it originated, when human progress was in its infancy, if indeed, it had commenced at all, i. e., thousands of years before the sun of Garrisonism, or of the An-

ti-Slavery Church, or even the effulgent light of the science of the nineteenth century beamed upon the world. The only issue I will here make with Mr. Foster, is, first—What is the testimony of Jesus relative to this Old Testament, or, in other words, of Moses—his history—his law, as a whole—the spirit of his institutions—his reliableness as a historian—the truth or falsehood of his pretension to inspiration, or the reception of his civil, political and ecclesiastical institutions from God, as he pretends? Also, as to the perpetuity or abrogation of what is commonly called the Law, or Moral Law; or, in other words, the precepts, commandments, &c., mentioned in the 19th Psalm, and every where else in the Psalms and Prophets, as well as in the Pentateuch, or five books of Moses?

Now, that Jesus ever conceived or spoke of Moses and his law, or, in other words, of the Old Testament, as Mr. Foster has done in his sermon, and as I have understood the Liberator to have done for the last fifteen years, I flatly deny, and join issue. Yet, for the sake of the argument, as above said, I concede Mr. Foster's representation to be the true view of the whole matter; and that Moses, and Ezra, his editor, and the seventy who translated the Hebrew Scriptures into what is called the Septuagint version, are to be taken, deemed and reputed to be just the kind of men as represented by Mr. Foster, and that their works are of the character he conceives and declares.

Now, the question is reduced to a mere matter of fact as to what Jesus (if correctly reported) has said upon the subject. As to Reason and Conscience, they may be wanted by and by, but they have nothing to do with the question now at issue. All we have to do is to examine the record of the four, so-called, Evangelists. First, I will call Matthew upon the stand. He, as a reporter, is my witness. He is, however, subject to the law of cross-examination and impeachment.

Question. Mr. Witness, did you know Jesus of Nazareth, the reputed son of Joseph and Mary, who was first a carpenter, then a pretended prophet, or the pretended Messiah?

Answer. I did.

Ques. Did you ever hear him speak of Moses and the Prophets, or of the Septuagint version of the Scriptures, as they were called in your day?

Ans. I have heard him speak of them very frequently in public and private during the whole course of his public ministry, or from the time I left the receipt of Custom to follow him.

Ques. You were then one of his disciples and followers?

Ans. I was.

Well, let us hear what you heard him say about Moses, the Law, and the Old Testament scriptures.

Witness. It would require volumes to relate all I have heard him say upon this subject, for this was almost his only theme of discourse during the time I knew him. The Scriptures were our text book, and it was the business of Jesus to teach his disciples what Moses, in his law, or in his five books, had taught concerning God, Man and Nature; and the relation of man to God, of God to man, and of man to himself and to his fellow-man; the promises and threatenings of God to the righteous and the wicked, as the obedient and disobedient to God's law, which were taught God gave to Moses, and which Moses wrote in his five books. Moses also gave the history of man, or of the world, from its beginning to his day.

Court. We are well aware of all this; but we only want a few definite statements concerning Moses and his Law. What did Jesus say definitely concerning them, and especially of the Law?

Ans. In his Sermon on the Mount, chap. 5, 17th, 18th and 19th verses of my Gospel, he thus spake upon the subject:—'Think not I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Who-soever, therefore, shall break one of the least commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven (that is, as we understood him, shall have no part therein); but who-soever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.' Very much more (I understand Matthew to say) was said upon this subject of Moses' law in this sermon, the grand object and scope of which was, to vindicate and restore the law or scripture from the false interpretation or glosses of interpretation whereby the spirituality and glory of the law or religion of the scripture had been marred, defaced, and almost obliterated during the preceding centuries, since the days of Ezra.

Question by the Court. Did you ever hear your master speak disrespectfully of Moses, or of the prophets, or as though they were not reliable historians—not enlightened theologians, or in any way incompetent or false in their testimony or injunctions upon men?

Ans. Never.

Ques. Did your master never sever from the doctrine and statements of the Sermon on the Mount, which you have recorded in the 3th, 6th and 7th chapters of your narrative?

Ans. No, never. May it please the Court—You have my whole succinct narrative of the sayings of my master; please read for yourselves, and judge if there be any discrepancies.

Question by the opposite party. Have you read my sermon, delivered Oct. 26, in Concord, Ms.?

Ans. I have done what is equivalent. As a glorified saint, I have come to know what you preached.

Ques. Well, sir, did you and your master take the same view of Moses, the law and the prophets, and of the New Testament, which I took in that sermon?

Ans. No! Verily, the Zenith of heaven and the Nadir of hell are hardly farther apart, physically, than you and we are, morally.

Ques. But, did not your master soften the rigors and lessen the penalties of the Mosaic code, and especially of the Ten Commandments?

Ans. Nay, verily. Please read my whole report of his sermon, and you have a specimen of all he ever taught upon this point.

Ques. Did he not abrogate the Sabbath, or make void the fourth commandment?

Ans. No, verily. He corrected some of the false notions then prevalent concerning it; but no man, from Moses to this day, ever observed it more in accordance with its nature, and the law concerning it, than he did?

Ques. Did not Christ introduce a new law, different from and contrary to that of Moses, and make it the basis of his Church?

Ans. No, verily; at least, we never so understood or so reported him—did we? Who? When? Where?

Ques. Well, sir, what do you, including your Master, think of such professed Christians as hold and teach such doctrine as my sermon contains? For, you observe, we profess to be Christians, not infidels. We claim to call Jesus Master and Lord, as well as you. What would Jesus say to us if he were here upon the earth?

Ans. Just as he said to those of like character in his day. As a specimen, read the 21st, 22d and 23d verses of the 7th chapter of my narrative, which read as follows:—'Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. Many will say unto me in that day, (i. e., the day of judgment,) Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them—I never knew you; depart from me, ye workers of iniquity! That is enough. Witness may be released.'

Now, in like manner, I might call Mark, Luke, John, Paul and Peter; but I forbear. If you dare

call them on to the stand, do it, at your peril. They are my witnesses, and as such you may call them. I will rest my case for now on the testimony of Matthew, together with the assumption that you do not dare to call the rest for cross-examination. Should you attempt any proof to the contrary of Matthew, or should the Court demand further proof, I will call them all on, but I rest here for now.

Now, admitting Mr. Foster to have given a true exposé of the Old Testament, then it was sanctioned by Jesus and all his school, and Jesus was as ignorant and as false to the truth as Moses and the prophets. Paul's testimony to this point is the sum of the New Testament:—'Having therefore obtained help of God, I continue unto this day, witnessing both to small and great, saying none other things than the prophets and Moses did say should come.'

This I affirm, (and who can deny it?) that Jesus and his whole school of disciples did just as Paul said he had done, viz., never contradicted, traduced, or in any manner spoke evil or slightly of Moses or the prophets; but, on the contrary, with Paul on another occasion, uniformly testified that 'All scripture was given by inspiration of God, and was profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.' 2 Tim. 3:16, 17. And with Peter—2 Pet. 1:19—'For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.'

Now, if the Old Testament is as Mr. Foster and his coadjutors testify, then we know precisely what Jesus and all the New Testament writers adopted, confirmed, reiterated, or intended to; but if they were such stupid blockheads as to have totally mistaken Moses and the prophets, and to have embraced a totally other thing than the Old Testament, if Mr. Foster is to be credited, then has the world been deceived, deluded, and led astray by Jesus, as no other man ever did or could do. Yes, and dear Mr. Foster himself seems to have been in the same delusion till within the last three years, during which time he has taken and read the Liberator, the sun of latter-day glory! Poor man! he sat in darkness, and in the region and shadow of death; but light, light from the Liberator, has shown upon him, and now he wants all his poor neighbors to subscribe for the 'cheapest and best publication in the United States';—and no wonder. But to return.

The question is—Are Moses and Jesus at odds? I answer, No, verily! Is the New Testament at variance with the Old? I answer, No; verily, No! Has Mr. Foster represented the Bible, either the Old or New Testament, truly? I answer, No! as above. Is Mr. Foster justly entitled to the name of Christian? I answer, No; not unless he can prove, better than he has done, that Jesus was opposed to Moses and the prophets, and has built his church on a new foundation, distinct from and opposed to that on which the Jewish church stood, which thing I defy the united powers of the Liberator to do.

According to Mr. Foster, Moses, like his age, was but partially civilized, not inspired; wrote a false history, or a history abounding with false statements; reasoned fallaciously on many subjects; was superstitious, like his age and times; enacted absurd, wicked, foolish, oppressive laws, &c., and falsely threatened them upon God for effect. I do not give his words, but will hereafter give a few specimens. Is Mr. Foster an infidel? or is he belied when so called? I answer, if the word has any meaning, he is an infidel, and is not belied.

Now, Mr. Editor, I give you this alternative: show that the Old and New Testaments are not on the same foundation, but that Christ and his apostles are as much opposed to Moses and the prophets as Mr. Foster represents them to be, and that Christ and the apostles understood and represented them as Mr. Foster does, and rejected them for the same reason; or, second, admit that Christ wholly mistook Moses, and ignorantly approved of him, without knowing what he did; (in which case, who and what is Christ? wherein lay his knowledge?) or, third, that Mr. Foster makes a mighty mistake in rejecting Moses, and yet elevating Jesus; for Jesus is as verily pro-Moses, pro-law, and pro-prophets, as any Northern doughface is pro-slavery—deny this, if you can; or, fourthly, you must receive Moses and the prophets— or, in other words, receive the religion of the Bible, the whole Bible—as Mr. Foster represents it, and as sanctioned by Christ; or, fifthly, you must do, as *de facto*, you have done, according to the best of my knowledge, judgment and belief, for the last fifteen years, reject the religion of the Bible, as such, as UNINSPIRED—a tissue of mistakes—abounding with truth and error, light and darkness, and set up a new, better, yet, a perfect standard of faith and practice. If you cleave to Jesus and to Mr. Foster both, you must have Moses and the prophets as Mr. F. has exhibited them. If you will not have Moses, you cannot have Christ. They are in a sense one and indivisible, as verily as Joshua and Moses, so made by the whole acts and life of Christ himself. Moreover, if you reject the Bible—or the Old Testament, even—and its religion, you must, in consistency, reject God himself, which probably would be no great cross to you.

But, in plain language, I reject the sermon, and repel all its blasphemies, and will report the characters upon the author which he has charged upon Moses. He charges Moses with writing false history—misrepresenting the mind and will of God—with reasoning fallaciously—making false pretensions about the origin of his law, and, in a word, of all his writings; he places him on a level with Confucius, and, of course, with political and moral reformed, or pretended reformers, in general. Now, in my turn, I aver that he (Mr. F.) is as ignorant of Moses, of the truth of his history, of the origin, natural character and tendency of his institutions, as he supposes Moses to have been of the subjects and things of which he wrote. Mr. Foster is not a reliable historian—a most fallacious reasoner, or ignorant or false logician, and, in truth and fact, an infidel, as before said, if that term has any meaning. He is an anti-Christ as he is anti-Moses or anti-slavery. He is anti-Bible; and if he knew enough, and was conscientiously consistent with himself, he would be anti-God, or renounce all his late attainments, which he has acquired by reading the Liberator, and go back to his old position, or find a new and better one. To sustain this position, and these allegations, I need only to transcribe the sermon, and add a few notes in brackets; but this I cannot do here. The sermon occupies seven columns of the Liberator, but I must not ask for more than two and a half, or three, at most.

I will, however, make a few quotations, in confirmation of my assertions. We have first what he calls 'the senseless story' about Adam and Eve, the fall and the consequences, not in Moses' words, more than in his meaning, neither of which is here; and in relation to his own caricature, he thus writes:—'If this narrative be true, then God did make an arbitrary and unreasonable law, and connected moral guilt with conduct in itself as innocent as that of looking at a flower would be, and ordained consequences to flow therefrom which should fill this world with wretchedness and death. Nor is this all. This senseless story be true, God did actually tempt man to sin.' 'It is manifest absurdity, whoever states it, and wherever found, that there ever was a tree of life, the eating of whose fruit would confer immortality upon the partaker. We have, then, no alternative. We are forced to conclude that the writer or compiler of the book of Genesis, in this instance, relates a myth of the dim and distant past, which accorded with the superstition of his time. He must be mistaken in the whole matter, for if he is correct, God is tyrannical, malicious and unreasonable.' 'Where, then, stands this claim for the plenary inspiration of the Bible?' We are next cited to

the story of Abraham and Isaac, in relation to which he says, 'In regard to this story, I affirm that the spirit of Christ and unperturbed reason alike revolt from the whole statement, and stamp it as a lie.' Very modest this for a Christian minister to say of Moses, as a historian and prophet of God, equal to 'Confucius, a burning and shining light'! Again, he says of the same story, 'Here, again, the writer of Genesis has related a myth which was consonant with his general writings. In the light of Christ and of Conscience, we pronounce this statement wholly destitute of truth.' Here Moses is denounced, with an appeal to Christ and Conscience, as a liar and mythologist; of course, he must be either a fool or a knave, or both. Very reverential, truly!

We are next requested to 'look at the story of Jacob and Esau.' Here, as in both the preceding specimens, we have not a word of quotation from Moses, but only his own construction of him, which I pronounce to be garbled, false and unfair. When finished, he calls it as above, 'a myth of a dark age,' with which God had nothing to do. 'My conclusion is,' he continues, 'that the whole is false.' What, then, shall we think of Moses? Is he a true witness for God? a reliable historian? No, verily!

(Concluded next week.)

AMSTERDAM, Dec. 12, 1851.

DEAR SIR:

Enclosed are two dollars for the Liberator. As an anti-slavery paper, it is the most reliable and unswerving in the land. Its course is honorable, dignified, and uncompromising. I have been pained that it should sometimes be made the medium for disseminating sentiments not only not congenial with, but hostile to, the great cause of freedom which it advocates with so much fidelity. I allude to the publication of Mr. Foster's sermons, and other matter of a like character. Just in proportion as we weaken the faith of the community in the Bible, we cut away one of the main supports of the anti-slavery cause.

When the two dollars which I now send you is used up, you will please stop my paper, unless I forward you another payment at that time.

Very respectfully, yours, &c.,

ELLIS CLIZBE.

BOSTON, Dec. 20, 1851.

MR. GARRISON:

Sir,—Justice to one engaged like yourself in beating down the ramparts of error and superstition, induces me to call your attention and that of your readers, to a very worthy and deserving person now in our city. I allude to Dr. NOYES WHEELER, who has recently established himself at No. 165 Washington street, as a *Practical Phrenologist*. This gentleman has made himself poor by refusing to prostitute the noble science of Phrenology to the ungodly purpose of upholding the evils of the present state of society, as is done by some distinguished Phrenologists. He is as plain and outspoken as yourself in his lectures and examinations, and on that account fails to receive the professional patronage to which his talents as a Phrenologist entitle him. I would advise all our anti-slavery friends, both in the city and country, who wish to have their heads examined, to give him the preference over those who do not need patronage. He is acknowledged by all who have tested his skill to be superior in examining heads to almost any Phrenologist in the country; but as his honesty and humanity equal his professional skill, he shares the fate nearly all those who love truth better than profit.

I make these remarks without the knowledge of Mr. Wheeler, simply because I feel interested in his case, and desire that such a true-hearted man should not be allowed to suffer. He lectures on Saturday evenings, and gives public examinations, at Chapman Hall, in Chapman place, which leads out of School St., near the Horticultural Hall. Mr. Fowler himself has recommended Dr. Wheeler as 'one of the best practical Phrenologists in the United States'; and other persons, who have known him for many years, regard him as superior to any other one.

Yours respectfully,

C. STEARNS.

STONEHAM, Dec. 29, 1851.

MR. GARRISON:

DEAR SIR,—Allow me, through the columns of the Liberator, to speak of the pleasure and profit we have received by two admirable lectures from Lucy Stone on Woman's Rights. She understood her subject thoroughly, treated it candidly, and proved, by incontrovertible facts, that women are woefully degraded, both by law and the usages of society. Her manner was easy, pleasing and unassuming, her language choice and forcible, her illustrations apt and striking. She gives to the work a strong, vigorous mind, keen powers of discrimination, extensive knowledge, and a heart overflowing with sympathy for the wronged every where, irrespective of sect or sex, color or creed. With a lofty purpose, and beautiful, self-sacrificing spirit, she is devoting herself to the great work of regenerating the race; and I hope, wherever she goes, the women will make strenuous efforts to aid her labors by that countenance and patronage she so richly merits.

P. G.

From the N. H. Independent Democrat.

### MR. WEBSTER'S POETRY.

Solomon's times were not like our times, or else Solomon was not so wise as he might have been. He would certainly not, and risk his reputation by writing, 'There is nothing new under the sun,' since the following *original poetry*, sent on by Daniel Webster to the New England Society of New York, at their recent celebration of the Landing of the Pilgrims, is 'brand-new,' and nothing else.

WASHINGTON, Tuesday, Dec. 23, 1851.

We drink the health of the Sons of the Pilgrims.

May Plymouth Rock

Stand every shock,

Till time shall be no more.

As this is supposed to be Mr. Webster's first effort to woo the muses, and may be his last, it is due to his many friends and admirers to give him more than